THE

Churchman's Magazine.

[Vol. IV.] SEPTEMBER, 1807. [No. 9.]

BIOGRAPHY.

Memoirs of the Right Reverend Samuel Horsley, LL. D.

F. R. and A. SS. late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.

[Continued from page 286.]

HAVING mentioned the doctor's resignation of his place as Secretary of the Royal Society, we are naturally led to narrate the particulars of his secession from that illustrious institution. When Sir Joseph Banks succeeded Sir John Pringle, as President of the Royal Society, a more than commendable degree of partiality was said to have been manifested towards those members who were distinguished by the appellation of *virtuosi*. Their pursuits and discussions also engrossed more attention, and obtained more honorable marks of distinction than the productions of more learned and scientific men. Improper measures were likewise taken to prevent the election of some respectable candidates, whose qualifications consisted principally in their profound acquaintance with mathematical learning. These circumstances gave great offence to many of the ablest and most active members, but it was not till a direct attack was made upon the scientific body in the person of one of its most eminent members, that the smothered resentment broke out into open hostility and rupture.

The office of the Society's corresponding secretary, an employment of great honor, much trouble, and little profit, the annual salary being no more than 20l. had been held, and the duties of it ably and punctually discharged for some years, by Dr. Charles Hutton, Professor of Mathematics in the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich. On the 20th of Nov. 1783, the President summoned his council for the purpose of depriving Dr. Hutton of his office. This purpose was effected by a resolution of the council, which was said to be a method of *letting down the Doctor easy;* namely, that it was expedient for the foreign secretary to reside constantly in London. In this resolution the council unanimously concurred; with the exception of Dr. Maskelyne, the astronomer royal, and Mr. Maty, one of the principal secretaries, who very properly desired that Dr. Hutton might be heard before he was dismissed.

At a subsequent meeting, one of the members, in an elegant and pointed speech, proposed a vote of thanks to Dr. Hutton, which was with some difficulty carried by a majority of five. No sooner was the meeting broken up, than the President summoned a council, at which the resolution of the former council, respecting Doctor Hutton, was declared a wise one, and ought to be enforced. On the meeting of the society the next day, Dr. Horsley moved that Dr. Hutton's defence, which the council had treated not only as nugatory, but as a full justification of the former council, should be read to the society. The motion was introduced with a short speech, in which the proceedings of the council of the preceding day were treated with great freedom, and the injustice shown to Dr. Hutton with high indignation. This motion was seconded by Dr. Maskelyne, and no reply being made, Dr. Hutton's defence was read.

This defence having made a considerable impression, the President summoned a cabinet council of his friends, to deliberate on what was best to be done. The result of their deliberations was, that some motion should be brought forward which should quash all enquiry into the President's official conduct, by a general vote of thanks or approbation. A card was accordingly sent to all the members of the society, requesting their attendance on the 8th of January; at which meeting the following motion was made and seconded:— "That this society do approve of Sir Joseph Banks for their President, and will support him." This motion was very warmly opposed in a very sensible speech by Mr. Edward Poore. He was followed on the same side by Mr. Baron Maseres; to whom succeeded Dr. Horsely, who, in a very modest manner, mentioned the time he had devoted, the contributions he had made, and the high office he had borne in the society. This he did as a presumptive evidence that he would not be willing to disturb the peace of the society, and call off its attention from his own favorite pursuits. But abuses he alledged had been long practiced, and were still increasing, which must affect the honor and prosperity of the society, which in fact threatened its very existence, and for which debate was the only remedy. The following address to the President was peculiarly excellent, and strongly characteristic of the speaker's manner:

"Sir, if I should consider the motion as a mere compliment to the President, having neither retrospect nor consequences, I would be one of the foremost to concur in it. For, Sir, whatever warmth of resentment I may be apt to feel and to express, when I conceive the character of my friend to be injuriously attacked; with whatever zeal, with whatever vehemence of zeal, I may be ready to rise, when the chartered rights of this society are to be asserted, when its constitution is to be defended against encroachments; I am still ambitious to seize every fair occasion of expressing personal respect to Sir Joseph Banks. And I feel it a most painful task, which my duty to the society imposes on me, to arraign and to expose his conduct, in the high office which he does us the honor to hold among us. Sir, it has been suggested to me, by gentlemen who conceive that debate is the worst thing which can happen in this society, that if the abuses with which I charge the President's government do re-

ally exist, I might take a better and more effectual way of obtaining the remedy: of accomplishing what they consider to be my ultimate purpose, by communicating my opinion to the members of the society in private visits: and I am really inclined to think that this is very good advice. If my intention were to cure the abuses of the President's government by preventing the renovation of his authority next St. Andrew's day, I do think that this purpose might be more certainly carried in the way which has been recommended to me. But, Sir, I believe you will yourself allow, that the method which I now pursue of public debate and discussion, if a less certain, is a far more fair and honorable way. You would rather, Sir, that I should make your plan of government a topic of public debate, than that I should calumniate your character in private. This, therefore, is the method to which I shall adhere as the most honorable. I must, therefore, however unwillingly, speak to the merits of the question now before us: and if I should bring forward offensive matter, I must entreat your candid hearing. You are a public man in this Society: your conduct, therefore, must be subject to revision: and you must bear with an adversary who charges you publicly, because he disdains to wound in secret."

In another part of this admirable speech, in allusion to this irregular mode of voting support to the President, the doctor observed,

"As for those *optimists*, who hold Sir Joseph Banks to be the best of all possible Presidents to be found in this best of all possible worlds, let them come down at the next anniversary, and re-elect him. That will be the season for giving him support. At present no support can be given him, unless it be the unjust support of approving the conduct towards Dr. Hutton, which the Society hath already condemned, or of securing him against all future complaint by a general vote of approbation."

The speaker then goes on to vindicate Dr. Hutton, after which he proceeds to the adduction of his charges against the President, particularly with regard to the influencing of elections, eight very strong and flagrant instances of which he entered into the particular history of, but was at last borne down by an incessant clamor for the question on the part of the President's friends, with an accompaniment of sticks. In the midst of this indecent confusion, so unworthy of any meeting, and particularly a philosophical one, Dr. Horsley indignantly closed his speech, in the following strong terms:

"Sir, since it is the resolution of your friends, that I am not to be heard upon an argument, to which they are conscious that they can frame no reply, I shall struggle no longer with their clamour. I shall say but a few words more. Sir, it would be absurd to vote for the present question without a discussion of its merits. Approbation is no approbation, unless it be accompanied with a conviction that it is deserved, on the part of those who bestow it. Sir, I well know the generosity of your high spirit will reject an approbation voted in ignorance. Sir, you will say to us, *Give me no approbation till you are satisfied that I deserve it. Approbation given, while a suspicion may remain that it is undeserved, is a false compliment.*

Falsus honor juvat——
Quem nisi mendosum et mendacem?

Let the charges which have been set up against my conduct, be fairly discussed and fully investigated. When they are found to be groundless and nugatory, then give me your approbation. Your approbation given then *will gratify me; because it will be at the same time an approbation of me, and a censure of those who have dared, without cause, to arraign my conduct. Approbation given now, before these charges are done away, were premature. It will not gratify me. It will offend.* These, Sir, I know to be your sentiments. I concur with you in these sentiments: and I move the previous question."

Dr. Maskelyne rose next, and after a short speech, seconded the motion for the previous question. Lord Mulgrave having said, that "some *broad hints* might be necessary to convince the gentlemen who seemed so active in promoting these dissentions, how highly their conduct was disapproved by the majority of the Society;" Dr. Horsley rose in some warmth, and addressed the President in these words:

"Sir, what has fallen from the noble lord, seems so directly pointed at me, that I must beg leave to say a few words, to inform the noble lord what may be the effect of *broad hints*. Sir, we see and confess the extent of the President's personal interest. We see that great numbers may be occasionally brought down, to ballot upon particular questions, who do not honor the Society with a very regular attendance. We are well aware, Sir, that oppressive statutes may be framed in the council, and, with this support in the Society at large, received. We understand, that motions, personally offensive and injurious, may be brought forward, and perhaps may be carried. And by these means the remedies, which the scientific part of the Society would wish to apply to the abuses which exist, may be prevented. But, Sir, I am united with a respectable and numerous band, embracing, I believe, a majority of the scientific part of the society; of those who do its scientific business. Sir, we shall have one remedy in our power, when all others fail. If other remedies should fail, we can at last secede. Sir, when the hour of secession comes, the President will be left with his train of feeble *Amateurs*, and that toy* upon the table, the ghost of that society in which philosophy once reigned, and Newton presided as her minister."

On putting the previous question, the numbers were, for it 59, against it 106, the President's own vote included. The main question was then put, and the members were against it 42, for it 119. The President's *own vote in his own cause* again included.

Further efforts were made by Dr. Horsley and the other friends of Dr. Hutton to procure his re-establishment, and to check the increasing despotism of the President, but without effect. A new stretch of power was soon afterwards exhibited, of which the following account appeared in the "Public Advertiser of April 6, 1784."

"We hear that the President of the Royal Society has given fresh disgust to several of the fellows of it, by a step he has just taken concerning the office of one of the principal secretaries, which has lately become vacant by the resignation of the Rev. Mr. Maty. He has sent round a card to all the fellows of the Society, (to whom the election of a new secretary belongs) to inform them, that Dr. Blagden (a

* Pointing to the mace.

respectable and learned physician) has offered himself a candidate for the office, *at his desire*, and to recommend him to their choice. This expression *at his desire*, seems to imply that no person ought to presume to be candidate without his approbation, or even be supposed to have any chance of succeeding without it, or of failing of success when he has obtained it: which are implications that are by no means agreeable to the more independent members of the Society. This card is called by many of them, *the President's Conge d'Elire*. Dr. Horsley, in particular, gave it that title publicly at the meeting of the Society at Somerset Place, on Thursday last, the 1st of this instant April, 1784. 'It is,' said he, 'a call upon the Society to elect a new secretary, and a nomination by the President, *as their sovereign*, of the person he would have them choose; which is exactly similar to the proceeding of the King in the nomination of a new Bishop."

In a very ingenious pamphlet written by Mr. Maty, one of the Minority, entitled "An History of the Instances of Exclusion from the Royal Society, which were not suffered to be argued in the late Debates," are these observations on this unphilosophical warfare:

"The Royal Society *was* a *Society;* we do not wish to see it a *monarchy;* it *did* conduct itself according to the rules of justice and equity: we desire it may not violate those rules; its principles *were*, that the first distinction of men is virtue, and the second learning; we cannot bear that birth should take rank with either of these.—Now, the President does think that it ought; and *therefore* it is proper to look out for one, who, with Sir Joseph Banks's merits, be those merits what they may, does not think so." The conclusion of the same tract, which, though written by Mr. Maty, was drawn up under the inspection, and expressed the sentiments of the whole respectable minority, is as follows:

"If *indeed* the dignity of the Society has been committed, and if our learned brethren of Europe, have *indeed* reason to lament, that we stand no longer on that high eminence where they loved to see us; it was then committed, when, for the first time, and with a fatal example to literature, an example that has been but too much followed, we suffered our chair, which ever before had been offered to unassuming modesty, to be claimed and publicly canvassed for through this great town; it was committed when we received into that chair, the chair of Newton, a gentleman who had not published a single line in our Transactions, nor given any sign of literary merit, but what might have been given by one of the humblest of the votaries of the humblest of the sciences; it was committed when we sent forth to Europe, at the head of our learned volume, a speech of that gentleman, deficient in English, deficient in idea, full of fulsome and undignified adulation of ourselves, mean and inadequate in expressions of respect and gratitude where the highest respect and gratitude are due. The dignity of the Society was committed, when we sat patiently by, and saw that gentleman encouraging those very disorders he was elected to restrain; at one time voting in his own cause; at another affecting not to count the balls in a question which was going against him; a third, taking the sense of the body, in direct opposition to a positive statute, by tumultuous acclamation; cling-

ing, in short, like a polypus, to every one of his usurpations; and never (which has driven us to this harsh necessity) never at any one period of the long nine months the contest has now lasted, acknowledging that he *might* be mistaken, promising that he would amend; or even soliciting a friendly conference of the two parties, authoritatively to settle what might be amiss. Finally, our dignity has been essentially committed, by some of us persisting, against every admonition, and by every artifice persisting, to support acts which it is one of the first and darling distinctions of science to abhor and repress, acts of arrogance, acts of injustice, acts of inhumanity. These are our real humiliations; these are the true causes, that point the unlearned finger at us. To aim at the cure of such evils, can lessen the dignity of no man, or set of men. On the contrary, it is to the honor of our natures that we have felt, it will long continue our boast and consolation that we have endeavored to redress them."

For entering into so particular a detail of these dissentions, our excuse is, that Dr. Horsley has been frequently charged with an overbearing arrogance and an intemperate zeal in the part which he took on the occasion. We are thoroughly convinced that every candid reader will see from this statement, which is in every point accurate, much to admire in the ardor of Dr. Horsley's friendship, in the open and manly avowal of his sentiments, in his liberal regard and support of men of modest merit and real learning, and not less in the dignified superiority of his mind, which scorned to appear in the courtly train of wealthy and pompous pretenders to science.

From this time he absented himself from the meetings of the Royal Society, till about a year or two ago, when some alterations for the better having taken place, he again gave his occasional assistance, and at the last anniversary was chosen one of the council.

[To be continued.]

FOR THE CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE.

Remarks on the 9th Chapter of Romans.

IN order rightly to understand the main object which the apostle here has in view, it is necessary to remark, what is very manifest from numerous places in the New-Testament, that the Jews, even after they became christians, could not be brought, but with a great deal of difficulty, to believe that the visible church of God was to comprehend the Gentiles: they still continued to think that the law of Moses was binding; that the covenant of circumcision made with Abraham, and confirmed into the people of Israel, was of unalterable obligation, and that none could be entitled to the visible privileges of God's covenant, unless they entered the fold of his chosen people by circumcision. This mistake St. Paul very largely combats, in many of his epistles; and he touches upon it in several places in this to the Romans; particularly in the fourth chapter, where he argues that Abraham was justified without circumcision, inasmuch as he had the testimony of God that he was righteous before the covenant was given. And from the promise made to Abraham, that in his seed *all the nations of the earth should be blessed*, he

argues that righteousness, or acceptance with God must be by faith, and not by circumcision; *Therefore*, says he, *it is of faith—to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.*

In this ninth chapter he takes up the same subject again, as is manifest from the very earnest protestations he makes of his regard for the Jews; assuring them that they had *a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge;* that he *had continual sorrow and heaviness of heart* on their account, who had been so distinguished by the special favours of God, *to whom* (in his own words) *pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenant, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.*—That those should fall away, and refuse to come into the church because it was set open to other nations also, was to him matter of great grief; especially as they were his countrymen. He then proceeds to show them how upon their own principles God might make choice of other nations to come into his church, as well as to have chosen them, for it was not all the seed of Abraham that were the children of promise; *but in Isaac shall thy seed be reckoned.* Nor again was it all the seed of Isaac which were entitled to the promise. *For while the children were yet unborn, and having done neither good nor evil; that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said the elder shall serve the younger; as it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.* When we look into the transaction here spoken of, it will appear to have relation only to the one being chosen to be the special seed, to whom the promise was made, and the other rejected; that from Jacob was to descend the Messiah, *in whom all nations of the earth were to be blessed;* and not at all to their personal future salvation. The expression, *the elder shall serve the younger*, implies no such thing surely. God conferred on Jacob the honor, and denied it to Esau, of being the progenitor of Christ according to the flesh; but this does not imply that he gave him any advantage with respect to a future life. He showed him a favor or mercy, which he denied to Esau; and this he had a right to do—for he may give to one five talents, and to another but one. And as to the expression, *Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated;* it is spoken in regard to the same designation of one *to*, and rejection of the other *from* the special dispensation of being the promised seed; and is to be explained by that circumstance, meaning no more than that he intended more favours for one than for the other. It can no more be understood literally than our Lord's words, where he says, *think not that I came to send peace on earth; I tell you nay, but a sword.* He hated Esau comparatively, not showing so many favors, so many marks of his bounty towards him as he did towards Jacob.

But he proceeds; *what shall we say then, is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid; for he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.* By turning to the place where God says this to Moses, we find that he says it altogether in regard to his special dispensation in calling the Jews to be his peculiar people or visible church on earth; and has no relation to the future condition of any one. Again he

says to Pharoah; *for this same cause have I raised thee up to show in thee my power, and that my name might be known in all the earth.* When we look into the account given of Pharaoh in Exodus, we find indeed, that God sometimes says, *I will harden his heart, that he shall not hearken unto thy voice, and I will get me honor upon Pharaoh.* He sometimes says, *I have hardened his heart.* At other times it is only a declaration that he has, or will harden his own heart. *And I know that he will not let you go, no, not with a mighty hand,* says God to Moses.

Thus it seems nothing more is meant when it is said that God hardened Pharaoh's heart, than that it was hardened by himself in consequence of what God did, which ought to have produced the contrary effect; just as our Savior's coming, through the perverseness of men, sent war and the sword on earth, instead of peace.—Pharaoh hardened his heart the more he was punished. He would not listen unto the voice of God by Moses, and so was hardened. And indeed the reason assigned by God, why he raised him up, does not seem to have any relation to his or any other person's future condition, but to the special case of the visible calling of the Jews; the point which the apostle has all the while in view. *For this purpose have I raised thee up, to show in thee my power, and that my name may be known in all the world.* That it might be known that God had certainly called Moses and the Jews; and had not called Pharaoh, and the Egyptians to be his church on earth. Pharaoh's heart was hardened against the evidence of this call, and he would not let the people go.

But we cannot infer from what is said in Exodus that he was shut out from any share in the covenant of circumcision; that it was hardened by any decree of God. We can clearly infer he was hardened against it, and would not come into it, while he still stood on the same foundation with other heathens. He was hardened as all other heathens then were, and now are against the light of revelation; God not having as yet seen fit to call them into the fold of his church: The order of his providence, and the course of his special dispensations not yet being ripe for extending the gospel to all the world. But however this may be, it is not said of Pharaoh that he was hardened, or that God hardened him to his eternal ruin. We cannot in justice extend the meaning of the words to such a sense, because this does not appear to be the subject of which the apostle is speaking, but only of an appointment, decree, or foreordination to temporal advantages. And he brings these instances of Isaac in preference to Ishmael; Jacob in preference to Esau, and of the people of Israel, in preference to Pharaoh and the Egyptians, on whom God bestowed special favors, and covenant privileges. From these examples he draws this conclusion; *therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.* Now if in the examples God is not represented as acting by a sovereign decree, in regard to a future life, as we have shown he is not, then neither does the foregoing conclusion imply any such doctrine, for the conclusion can include no more than the examples from whence it is drawn. The words then can mean no more than this; that God vouchsafes the favor of calling particular nations and countries into his church, when in his wisdom he sees fit, and denies that privi-

lege to others so long as he pleases. He shows this mercy in his own way and time, according to his absolute decree, and denies it to others. Thus did he by Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau; by the Jews and all other nations; and therefore thus may he, and is he now doing in calling in the Gentiles, to share in the visible covenant of his church; which is what the apostle is laboring to prove against the prejudices and errors of the Jews.

Further to prove that this is a true statement of the apostle's sense, let us proceed on with the chapter. *But thou wilt say then, why doth he yet find fault, for who hath resisted his will—nay, but O man! who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump, to make one vessel to honor, and another to dishonor?* The answer given to the objection stated in the former part of this passage is very proper, supposing the objection to be made against the doctrine as we have stated it to be; but not very applicable on any other supposition. God, as creator and giver of every good gift, has a right to make one to honor and another to dishonor; that is, to give more to one and less to another, as the potter does with the clay. The instance of the potter refers us to the act of God in creating and bestowing his gifts on men, and not at all to his treatment of them after they are created. It is true that the words honor and dishonor are sometimes used in the bible to express the states of exaltation and condemnation in another world; but their most usual meaning is that of dignity, respectability and worth; and on the other hand, the want of these qualities. In these respects the potter exercises his power in making his vessels, and so does God without injustice. He has made angels without any wrong to men. And he has made men endowed with reason and speech without any wrong to other beings who inhabit this earth; and consequently among the same order of beings, he may, and has for the same reason, endowed some with more and some with fewer faculties and powers; some with more, and some with fewer means. To some is given the word of his revelation, and to others it is not. To the Jews pertained *the covenant, and the giving of the law and the promise*, while they were withheld, and still are withheld from many others. To this partial dealing in God the apostle raises the objection, which he answers by the similitude of the potter; an answer by which the objection is completely removed, because God who is wise and good, can and will deal with all his creatures, by an exact rule of right, never requiring brick without straw; but where he has given more he will require more, and where he has given less, he will require less; as is plainly represented in the parable of the talents.

Thus the answer given to the objection proves what is the doctrine taught by the apostle, that God is sovereign, and acts by the counsel of his own will in creating and bestowing his gifts; but from hence it will not follow that he doth so in his mode of treating his creatures after they are created.

Finally to make it more manifest that the whole of this chapter relates to God's temporal dispensations in regard to a visible church on earth, after what has been remarked upon, he proceeds to cite several passages from the prophets, which speak of God's calling

the Gentiles into his church: *As he saith in Osee, I will call them my people which were not my people; and her beloved which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God.* This was an argument which ought to have had great weight with the Jews. The word of God itself had said that the Gentiles should be called in; how then could a Jew, who took that word of God for the guide of his faith, deny the truth of what he is laboring to prove, that God having distinguished the Jews by special dispensations, had the same right to distinguish other nations in the same way; and had done so by calling them into his church? If this be his object, the texts he cites are direct proofs of it. But if as some suppose, he is proving that God by an absolute decree elects some to eternal life, and turns others over to misery, these texts are little or nothing to his point. We cannot help seeing the force of them to prove that God intended to call other nations *his people*, that is *his people* in the same sense that the Jews were his people, for he says, *I will call them my people which were not my people.* Unless then we suppose that all Jews were elected to eternal life, which no one will pretend, this passage cannot be supposed to have reference to that subject; while it clearly proves what the apostle was really aiming to prove, that God *might* rightly, and *had* called other nations into his visible church, which they proudly disbelieved and denied.

What shall we say then, says he; what is the conclusion and consequence of all that has been said? To which he answers; *That the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith; but Israel which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.* These words clearly prove that the sum of all that has just been said relates to the calling of the Gentiles into the church, and the rejection of the Jews as a nation. The Gentiles and Jews are set in opposition the one to the other; one is affirmed to have attained, and the other to have failed of the *law of righteousness by faith.* They are spoken of collectively in a national capacity, the one attaining and the other failing; which therefore could not be meant of eternal life, since not every Gentile was saved, nor every Jew damned: but Gentiles were adopted into the visible church, and the Jew cast out; and this is the sum of all that is attempted to be proved in this chapter.

Lastly the reason why it has so come to pass is assigned. For to the question why they attained not, it is answered, *because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law; for they stumbled at that stumbling stone.* The Jews were rejected as a nation because they rejected the Messiah, and would remain under the dominion of the law of Moses. This was the law, by the works of which they sought to be, and claimed to be the people of God, and to be righteous before him; but so seeking they attained not, and the Gentiles came in their place.

Thus then, seeing the apostle uses such arguments, and draws such conclusions as we should do were we going to prove that God may and has distinguished particular nations and countries with special favors, which he has withheld from others, we ought in justice

to conclude that this was his object, and that he had no view to the eternal state of individuals in any thing he here says. The opposite doctrine, which supposes this chapter to relate to the eternal state of individuals, and considers it as fixed by an irreversable decree, seems to cast such an imputation upon the justice of God, and so much to impeach his goodness, that we should be induced to adopt the interpretation here given, provided it can be made to appear consistent with the meaning of the words. According to this interpretation God is represented as acting in a way perfectly consistent with all our notions of justice. Being under no obligations to create us at all, he may give us what faculties he pleases, and withhold what he pleases without doing wrong. But having created us and given us our powers and means, his own eternal rectitude must induce him to act on other principles than those of his power; for *shall not the judge of all the earth do right.* There is, throughout the word of God, a manifest distinction which he gives of himself, as creator and as judge. As creator he represents himself as all powerful, and as acting solely by the counsel of his own will. But whenever he speaks of himself as our ruler and judge, we find him acting on very different principles; then we find him speaking of *justice, righteousness, faithfulness, and truth* going before him, and being *the girdle of his loins.* He tells us of rewarding every one according to his works; of putting *judgment to the line, and righteousness to the plummet;* of bestowing eternal life on them who obey him; *but indignation and wrath* on all them who know him not, and obey him not; with a very great many like passages which the time would fail me to mention. All which put together, should make men doubt whether they understand St. Paul right in this chapter, when they suppose him teaching that God is arbitrary in the awards of another life. They would do well to look and see whether he is not speaking of the character of God as creator, instead of ruler and judge, as we have endeavored to show he is, and therefore that he may well enough be arbitrary.

On the whole then, when it is said, that God *hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth,* we cannot fairly conclude that this is spoken in regard to the awards of another life, and therefore that no such doctrine as election and reprobation depending on an absolute decree of God is here taught. And if it cannot be proved from this chapter, it will be more difficult to make it appear from any other in the bible. And if it does not appear to be taught in the bible, it certainly is not the creed of unassisted human reason: we shall not therefore need to discuss any arguments drawn from this source.

Let us then come to a conclusion by one or two general remarks relating to the point. All men act and speak as though they really believed they could promote their own salvation; as though God had put it in their power to do something; as though they were in some measure the disposers of their own future state: they praise and blame, they exhort and persuade others to work out their own salvation in this day of grace. From hence let us remember that at the bottom we agree in our feelings, whatever difference there may seem to be in our words. And, if all men thus act as though they

thought they had something to do in order to obtain eternal life, let us remember to be up and doing; and call to mind that it is of infinitely more importance that we perform our duty to God and each other, than that we be able to understand all mysteries, and have all faith. Let us be careful how we build our hopes of eternal life, on our capacity rightly to explain the difficulties in the word of God. But rather strive to practice those duties that are plain, and humbly wait upon God for wisdom to understand aright what he would have us do; and grace to assist us in doing all to his glory, and our eternal interests.

FOR THE CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE.

In the following Dissertation *On Infant Baptism and the Unity of the Church*, Quæsitor* will find, in substance, an answer to most of his questions. It was written without any view to those questions, but has been communicated by a correspondent, in hopes that it might throw some light on the subject, and afford a degree of satisfaction to the enquiring mind.

On Infant Baptism and the Unity of the Church.

AFTER our blessed Redeemer had spent the three last years of his life, in going *about and doing good*, to the souls and bodies of mankind, and establishing his divinity by the most unheard of miracles, he voluntarily yielded up himself to the death of the cross for the *sins of the world;* by which atonement he reconciled the Father of heaven to a fallen world, broke down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and threw open the doors of his church, to all kindred, nations and tongues. To accomplish this glorious work, (that is, reconciling man to God, as God was reconciled to man) he rose from the dead and commissioned his apostles, not only to proclaim these glad tidings to those who sat in darkness, and the shadow of death; but to be the governors—the guardians of his church, and the stewards of his mysteries; promising to be with them to the end of the world, i. e. with their commission, successively to be transmitted to faithful men throughout all generations.

And that they might be enabled to carry on this important work, without error or restraint, he promised them the baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire, which upon the day of pentecost they received; by which they were enabled to understand all languages, to work miracles, and confirm their mission by mighty signs. Thus armed, they issued forth into the world, proclaiming the gospel to all nations; instituting and establishing the church wherever they went; consecrating bishops, priests and deacons; and delegating to them power and authority, according to their several offices....Tit. i. 5. To these churches Paul and others of the apostles wrote many epistles, exhorting them by the mercies of Jesus Christ that there be no divisions, but that *they speak the same thing*, that there should be no *schisms in the body;* and that peace and unanimity might be established among all saints, they repeatedly inculcated this great article of the christian religion, that as *there is one Lord, one faith, one*

* See Magazine for June, page 213.

baptism, they should endeavor to *keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace*....Eph. iv. ch. 1. Cor. i. which chapters, with other corresponding texts, I earnestly recommend to the most serious perusal of all those who make divisions by separating themselves from the church.

Is it reasonable to suppose that when God had established order and harmony in the natural world, that he should leave the rational and more noble parts of his works without rule and order? No surely: from the morning of creation, when "the stars unitedly *sang his praise, and the angels shouted for joy*, man was subjected to order, and eternal peace suspended upon obedience.—But notwithstanding this, man, through the temptations of the devil, transgressed; he rendered himself liable to punishment, he introducing sin and all its consequent evils among the works of God. And no sooner had man forfeited the favor of his Maker, than confusion was introduced, he fled from the presence of his benefactor. Yet after a severe rebuke, a display of the divine character was exhibited in his readiness to accept of a mediator, and to the everlasting honor of his glorious name, he declares, *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.* Here commences the doctrine of grace. Here is the first dawning of the gospel—here the day-spring from on high visited the abodes of sinful man, opening and growing more luminous, till the fullness of time came, when it broke forth in a full blaze at the birth of the Messiah.

The history of the first ages of the world, is exceedingly short. The period of almost 2000 years being comprised in the eleven first chapters of Genesis, in which little is said respecting the Messiah, except the promise just mentioned; or of the ceremonies of public worship. These 2000 years brings us down to the days of Abraham, to whom God renews the promise of the Savior; covenanting with him that according to the flesh, he should proceed from him. The world being now overrun with idolatry, God saw fit to make more manifest his church, to preserve the worship of his name; choosing or electing Abraham and his seed, to be the peculiar members of this church, those of other nations being admissible only by complying with its institutions.

Here we shall do well to reflect upon the order and regularity enjoined by God. It was not enough we find to think honorably of this church, to acknowledge that the worship of the true God was preserved in it, to have a desire to join with this select society. No, this was not enough, unless they complied with the initiating seal of it, which was *circumcision*. The confused and popular notions of mankind that sacraments and ceremonies are of no use, were not authorised by God, who positively enjoined that this initiating seal should be put upon every one who would become a member of this church. Hence every one who was circumcised was a member and entitled to the privileges of it. Not only those who had faith to discover the benefits of this covenant relation to God were admitted, but their infant offspring were capable also of this blessing; without which God says they had broken his covenant, and should be cut off from his people....Gen. xvii. 14.

After the seed of Abraham had sojourned many years in the land of Egypt, God gave another institution to his church, viz. the passover; particularly prescribing the rites of this sacrament, of which no uncircumcised person should eat.

And when, by mighty signs and wonders, he had brought his chosen people out of the land of Egypt by the hands of Moses and Aaron, he proceeded further to institute many other rites and ceremonies; among which, and of great importance, was an order of men to minister in all matters of religion. The whole tribe of Levi was chosen for this service, out of which Aaron and his sons were appointed priests, himself as high priest, and his sons as priests of the second order; in which family it was to continue. And so far was any other person from having any right to intermeddle with these sacred offices, that when confusion was like to ensue by men's presumption, God more than once displayed his almighty power in the destruction of those who daringly presumed to invade. Behold the earth cleaving asunder, and swallowing up Korah, Dathan and Abiram, with their rebellious crew; Uzziah struck dead, for putting forth his hand to the ark; and the king of Israel struck with a leprosy for presuming upon the priesthood. These and many other striking instances of God's displeasure against those who would introduce confusion where he had established order, are kept upon record for our admonition, says St. Paul, who also testifies, that no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron, Heb. v. 4. compared with Exodt xxviii. and Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. Thus we see order and harmony established by God in his church, under its former and present dispensations.

Now let it be carefully remembered, that St. Paul, nay, all the sacred writers, speak of the church of God as one and the same church, however different in its external rites and privileges. This is a position of great consequence, to be seriously considered, for the want of which mankind are divided and subdivided into distinct and separate churches, and not only excuse themselves by saying God instituted two churches, but usurp his authority, constitute themselves into churches,* and tell you *the power of ordination is in the people.* Alas! what confusion has this brought upon the church of God, verifying the saying of our Savior, *Lo, here is Christ*; Lo, there is Christ; but let him that hath ears to hear, hear what the *spirit saith unto the churches, go ye not after them.* And surely no one who considers that God is the author of his church, and that he never had, nor will have but one church in this world, will not be guilty of going *in the way of Cain, nor run after the error of Balaam, lest he perish in the gainsaying of Core*....Jude 11.

But to prove the above position, and check the popular phrenzy, which has turned so many heads, I will introduce the reasoning of St. Paul, Gal. iii. *O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth.* After the Apostle has rebuked them sharply for their attachment to the rituals of the Jewish Church, he tells them that by neglecting the Levitical rites, (which had only served as a school master) they did not renounce the faith of Abraham, to whom the promise was made, i. e. the promise of Christ, who should

* See the first and second pages of the Methodist discipline.

bring life and immortality to light, and that by baptism they were initiated into the same church, that they formerly were by circumcision, being heirs of the same promise; this he illustrates by a very familiar instance in civil affairs, i. e. of an heir to an estate, introduced by telling us that *as many as were baptized into Christ, had put on Christ;* adding, *if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise*, and thus the Apostle continues, chap. iv. *Now I say that an heir as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be Lord of all, but is under tutors and governors, until the time appointed of the Father.* Even so we, when we were children, i. e. members of the Jewish Church, were in bondage under the elements of the world, such as washing of cups, and sacrificing with worldly substances. *But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them who were under the law;* then he adds for what purpose, *that we might receive the adoption of sons.* This reasoning is so perfectly conclusive, in proving but one covenant of grace ratified in Abraham, and confirmed by Jesus Christ, that the wit of man can neither add nor diminish, without wresting the sacred pages: for the comparison here, is not of two different persons, an heir and no heir, but of one and the same person; the heir while a child, and the same arrived to an adult age. The Jewish Church is represented as a child under age, the Christian Church as the same when become of full age. Hence the promise made to Abraham is called preaching the gospel to him, *Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are children of Abraham. The scripture foreseeing, that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached the gospel before unto Abraham, saying in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*

Should there remain even a shadow of doubt, the 11th of Romans concerning the olive-tree, and its branches broken off, and other branches grafted into the same stock, must rend the veil from the most prejudiced mind, and prove beyond all controversey, that God never had but one Church upon earth, that that Church has been under different administrations at different times, and has had different seals.

I have been the more particular on this part of my subject, as it is the key-stone to the whole christian fabric, fashioned by the divine hand and supported by divine power, *for he who built all things is God.*

To proceed then in a further enquiry how this building has been repaired and supported, we will for a few moments view it under the glorious dispensation of the gospel, where we shall find the inside work the same, and the old covering only laid aside, for materials of more enduring substance; the foundation the same remaining sure and steadfast; the edifice having twelve gates standing wide open to receive all nations who will enter. But as order must be preserved, Christ has not left his Church without governors and laws; for as no man could enter into the Church under the Jewish dispensation without being circumcised, so no one can enter, under the christian dispensation, without being baptized.

And that baptism is a sign of the seal of righteousness by faith into the same covenant, into which the Jews entered under the former dispensation, is abundantly evident from some of the most positive decla-

rations of Christ, and his Apostles. That noted passage of our Savior, in his conference with Nicodemus, *Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,* plainly declares the necessity of baptism, by which they were to enter into his kingdom, i. e. his church; which in a variety of places is called *the kingdom of God,* because Christ is king and head of his church; as the kingdom of heaven is likened unto a net cast into the sea and gathered of every kind, good and bad, which could not be the kingdom of glory, as no unclean thing can therein enter, compared with other corresponding texts. What strengthens and confirms this argument, that being born of water means baptism, or initiating into Christ's visible kingdom, and being born of the spirit a preparatory work for his invisible kingdom, is the universal consent of the whole universal church, for fifteen hundred years after Christ, none ever presuming to draw any other inference from it.

The commission of our Savior to his Apostles, shows the same... Mat. 28, *Go ye forth into all the world, baptizing all nations in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost,* as also, Mark xvi. 14, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned;* also the Apostle, *As many as are baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, and are heirs according to the promise;* and that baptism is to us the same that circumcision was to the Jews, is decidedly settled by the great apostle of the Gentiles...Col. ii. 11, *Ye are circumcised with the circumcision without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ;* what the circumcision of Christ is, he declares in the next verse, *Buried with him in baptism.*

But as few deny baptism to be an institution of Christ, for the initiating of members into his church, it is needless to dwell any longer on this part of my subject; but I shall proceed to the great object of all that has been said, i. e. who are the proper subjects.

That God never had but one church, and is the sole author of it, has been abundantly proved, from St. Paul, and that he commanded infants to be received into this church, is also evident. Therefore whatever change hath taken place in the ordinances of this church, and the seal of admission, the subjects are the same; unless it can be proved that God has forbidden infants to be received into it: But as this never has been proved, because God never has repealed that law, infants should be received, and whoever refuses to receive them, not only disobeys a positive command of God, but offends one of those little ones, of whom Christ says, *of such are the kingdom of God.*

But it may be said, that the covenant into which children were initiated, by circumcision, was a covenant of works, which ceased with the Mosaical dispensation. Little need be said in answer to this, since our Savior and St. Paul have in plain language denied it.... John vii. 22. Christ tells the Jews that circumcision was not of Moses, but of the fathers; and St. Paul as before has been shown, is very explicit in showing circumcision to be a seal of the righteousness of faith instituted four hundred and thirty years before the covenant of works, or the Mosaic covenant was made, and declares, as plain as language can declare any thing, that the covenant God made with Abraham

was the covenant of grace, confirmed before the covenant of works; then adds, "*the law*," the Mosaic covenant of works "*which was*" *ordained four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect;*" the gospel promise to Abraham, that in him all the families of the earth should be blessed. A promise and covenant receiving circumcision, for a time its seal, a promise extending to all the families of the earth, a promise manifested and made to Adam, the Patriarchs, Moses and the prophets, confirmed by Christ, illustrated, explained and enforced by his apostles, who tell us that baptism makes us heirs to the same gracious promise; *for as many of you*, says the apostle, *as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond, nor free:* i. e. the middle wall is broken down and the church is opened to all who will come, male and female; there being no distinction under the gospel, which concludes all under sin, and all equally want the *washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost*, by which all are made one in Christ Jesus; *and if Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.* Hence circumcision was not a Mosaic institution, and much less an initiating seal into the covenant of works; for I appeal to all candid people, what promise, and they will answer the promise God made to Abraham. What was the seal? faith and circumcision. What is the seal? faith and baptism. Who were the subjects? Jews and all proselytes, with their familes and little ones. Again: Who are subjects? all nations and kindreds of the earth, of every age, sex and color, who embrace the gospel; Acts ii. 39—*for the promise is to you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* Can any thing be more plain and rational than this? Here we see God, who is unchangeable, acting by means always adapted to the nature of his creatures, (who are always the same by nature, and want the same by grace,) according to the different dispensations of his Providence.

But however evident the validity of infant baptism may be; however supported by scripture and reason, sanctioned by the Son of God, there are many popular objections—as, 1st. It is said that faith is a prerequisite for baptism which infants have not, therefore ought not to be baptized; for says Christ, *he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* Very unhappily for our opponents, if this text proves any thing respecting infants, it proves an effectual bar against their entering into Christ's triumphant church, and sentences every infant dying before adult age, to damnation; for if want of personal faith debars an infant from the militant church, surely it must from the triumphant church: Thus adds our blessed Savior, *he that believeth not shall be damned.* It is always accounted unfair to produce a detached sentence of scripture to prove a favorite opinion, and especially if the whole passage proves the contrary (as in the above instance.) But if this loose random way of proving things from scripture will do, I will undertake to prove that infants ought to be starved to death; for thus says an apostle—*he that will not work, shall not eat.* Surely an infant is as incapable of earning its bread by the sweat of its brow, as to

save its soul by the exercise of faith; therefore upon the reasoning of these people, it must be starved in this world, because it cannot work, and damned in the next because it cannot believe.

But neither of these texts are applicable to infants, but to those of an adult age, who are capable of using means for the support of their bodies and souls; and as man is obliged to provide for those of his own household the necessary comforts of this life until they are of age to provide for themselves; so is he to believe for them, to pray for them, to offer them up to God in the way of his appointments; to promise for them till they are of age to take them upon themselves, and to instruct, and to bring them up *in the nurture, fear, and admonition of the Lord.* To say that a parent cannot promise for his child, is as inconsistent as to say he cannot clothe nor feed it. But that Christ will accept the child through the believing parent, is another evident fact from the following instances—Matth. viii. 13. *And Jesus said unto the centurion, go thy way, and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee—and his servant was healed in the self-same hour.* The paralytic man being healed on the faith of his father, and the little daughter restored by the faith of her mother, are striking instances of the efficacy of the faith and prayers of parents for their children; instances, which if sufficiently and seriously considered, would cure the prejudices of people against sponsors in baptism; influencing them to resolve with Joshua, to serve God in sincerity and truth. But this I will omit for the present, and proceed to another objection.

2nd. Infant Baptism is denied because our Savior in his commission, says, *go teach all nations*, &c. therefore infants being not able to receive instruction, must not be baptized.—I answer, 1st. Let it be considered that the disciples of Christ were commissioned to propagate christianity among all nations of the earth, by instructing them in the nature and design of this religion; and upon their receiving it as a divine revelation by Jesus Christ the Son of God, to baptize them in the name of the Father, &c. *teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever Christ had commanded them.* The word *teach* should in this place, imply no more than proclaiming the doctrines of the gospel, and discipliming (as the original stands) all those who receive it; afterwards teaching and explaining the laws and rules of christianity, as they were able to comprehend them; applicable to all christian nations and families, who offer their children in baptism; and as they grow in years, to teach them *what a solemn vow, promise and profession they have made.* Hence infants should no more be debarred from baptism, because they cannot be taught, than they should perish because they cannot feed and clothe themselves; for teaching, which implies instruction, is put after baptizing.

[To be continued.]

Calvinism Confuted.

A pamphlet has lately appeared in New-York, containing two Letters addressed to the EDITOR of the CHRISTIAN'S MAGAZINE, who, it seems, in that publication has attempted to enlist CALVINISM into his service, in the controversy concerning EPISCOPACY. Hence the Author of the pamphlet has stepped aside of his main point, for a few pages, in order to combat this auxiliary of Presbyterianism. With what good success the reader may judge from the following extract. [EDITOR.

I WAS in hopes, before I saw the *Christian's Magazine*, that Episcopacy would have been the only subject of dispute between us; but I find that you mean to discuss also the doctrine of election and the divine decrees. This, to be sure, has no particular bearing upon Episcopalians more than upon some other denominations, and, therefore, I might very well pass it over; but as it appears to me a very unreasonable and very unscriptural doctrine, it may not be amiss to say a few words upon it.

This subject you have introduced with a dilemma from the famous Calvinistic divine, Dr. Owen. The dilemma runs thus: "God imposeth his wrath due unto, and Christ underwent the pains of hell for, either all the sins of all men, or all the sins of some men; or some sins of all men." The latter branch of the disjunctive proposition, that Christ underwent the pains of hell for some sins of all men, is nothing to the purpose; for neither you nor I believe it. The dilemma then stands thus: "God imposeth his wrath due unto, and Christ underwent the pains of hell for, either all the sins of all men, or all the sins of some men." "The second," says the Doctor, "is that which we affirm, that Christ in their stead and room, suffered for all the sins of all the *elect* in the world. If the first, why then are not all freed from the punishment of all their sins?" To this question Christ himself gives a decisive answer—"Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life." Life then was procured for them—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem! How often would I have gathered you together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings; but *ye would not*." Christ *would*, but they *would not*. Again; "They which were called were not worthy"—were shut out from the marriage of the Lamb. Why so? Because, "they would not come." Thus it appears from Christ's own words, that he died for the sins of all men, and then the assertion that "Christ died for the sins of the elect only," is false.

You certainly know, Sir, that no conclusion of a syllogism can be deemed valid, when either of the premises wants proof. The Doctor gives no proof from scripture, that Christ's dying for all men involves the actual salvation of all men. His minor proposition therefore (were the dilemma reduced to a regular syllogism), is questionable. Consequently, his conclusion is illegitimate. But the Doctor is not satisfied with Christ's declaration; *ye will not come unto me that ye may have life*, which is the same as saying, ye will not believe in me. On this declaration is raised another dilemma. "This unbelief, is it a sin, or not?" Undoubtedly it is a sin. "If

it be, then Christ underwent the punishment due to it, or not?" He certainly underwent the punishment due to it. "If so, then why must that hinder them more than their other sins for which he died, from partaking of the fruit of his death?" Justice demands, that those who *will not* accept Christ's atonement—who *will not* be indebted to him for life and salvation, should be excluded from the kingdom of heaven. As life eternal is attached to faith, bacause it is the principle of holiness, so death eternal is the punishment of unbelief, because it is productive of wickedness. But for this unbelief Christ died. *I would*, said he, to the unbelieving Jews, but *ye would not*. Yet in the face of this declaration, Dr. Owen assumes the position, that Christ did not intend the salvation of all men. When men reason, they should remember, that there are certain indispensable rules attending it; and that one of these rules is, *never to assume*. And thus ends the dilemma of that famous divine, whose "grasp was death."

It is really surprising that you, Sir, a man of sense and learning, should propose to your readers a dilemma that, in truth, has not a horn upon which a mere smatterer in logic could be hooked. How humiliating to human nature, that learned and unlearned, wise and simple, should be so much upon a level, when prejudice or passion sways them! "That was excellently observed, say I, when I read a passage in an author where his opinion agrees with mine. When we differ, there I pronounce him mistaken."* This is, undoubtedly, the philosophy of the matter.

Will you, Sir, have the goodness to bear with me, while I offer to you a few texts of scripture to comment upon, in some future numbers of your magazine. I shall arrange them according to similarity of expression.

My first assortment is as follows: "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved."—John iii. 17. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."—John i. 29. "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world."—1 John ii. 2. "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world."—John iv. 14. "For I came not to judge the world, but to save the world."—John xii. 48. "For God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," &c.—2 Cor. v. 19. And many others of this sort.

The second assortment of scriptures runs thus: "Who gave himself a ransom for all."—1 Tim. ii. 6. "Because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they who live," &c.—2 Cor. v. 14, 15. "That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man."—Heb. ii. 9. "Who will have all men to be saved," &c.—1 Tim. ii. 4. "Not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."—2 Pet. iii. 9. "Therefore, as by the offence of one, the judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life."—Rom. v. 18. With many others.

My third collection of texts is the following: "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died."—Rom. xiv. 15. "And

* Swift's Thoughts on various Subjects.

through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died."—1 Cor. viii. 11. "Even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."—2 Pet. ii. 1. "Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace?"—Heb. x. 29. "Then his lord, after he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant! I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me: Shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow servant? And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due to him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye from your heart forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."—Matt. xviii. 32, 33, &c.

In return for Dr. Owen's dilemma, I present to you, Sir, the following demonstration, with which, and a short view of Calvinism, I shall close this long letter.

If Christ died not for all men, then are not all men bound to believe in him for salvation. But all men *are* bound to believe in him for salvation. Therefore Christ died for all men.

The major proposition is so obvious to common sense, that I cannot suppose any man will hesitate to acknowledge the truth of it. The minor proposition—*all men are bound to believe in him for salvation*, is evident from the holy scriptures, which are as clear upon this point as the mid-day sun in an unclouded sky. "And the times of this ignorance God winked at: But now he commandeth *all men every where* to repent."—Acts xvii. 30. If to *repent*, then certainly to believe in Christ. "And this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ."—1 John iii. 23. [A hard commandment to the reprobates, who, were they to believe in him, would believe a lie, as upon the Calvinistic principle, he did not die for them. Horrible!] Again: As God commands all men to believe in Christ, so he threatens with damnation all those who do not believe in him. "He that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 16. "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."—John iii. 36; and several other texts of the same import.

Further: As God commands all men to believe in Christ—threatens all with death who do not believe—promiseth life and salvation to all who shall believe; so he suggests reasons and motives to encourage men to believe in Christ, or on himself through Christ, for salvation. Sometimes he mentions his great love to them, as in John iii. 16. Titus iii. 4, &c. Sometimes his mercy and compassion. Exod. xxxiv. 6. Luke i. 72, &c. Sometimes the delight and pleasure he takes in showing mercy. Micah vii. 18. Ezek. xxxiii. 11. Sometimes he gives them an oath for their greater security in his promises. Heb. vi. 17, 18. Luke i. 72, 73. Sometimes he expresses his desire of their salvation. 1 Tim. ii. 4. Ezek. xxxiii. 11. Sometimes his grief at their wicked courses. Ezek. xviii. 31. Jer. xliv. 4. Sometimes he declares the abundant provision he hath made for their salvation. Matt. xxii. 4. Heb. ix. 14. And sometimes he even condescends to the consideration, that glory will result

to himself and to his grace, by men's believing, and their consequent salvation. Eph. i. 12. Now, all these commands, threatenings, promises, and encouragements, proving, beyond the possibility of reasonable contradiction, the truth of the minor propositition, that *all men are bound to believe in Christ for salvation*, it follows irresistibly, that *Christ died for all men.*

As the Calvinistic system of divinity will, in all probability, be a subject of dispute as well as Episcopacy, I shall take the liberty, before I conclude, of drawing out that system, for the benefit of those who may not be very well acquainted with it. The following propositions are all to be found in Calvin's writings: The absolute and unconditional election or predestination of particular individuals to eternal salvation; and the equally absolute and unconditional reprobation of all the remaining part of mankind, without respect of persons. As preparatory to this divine act of predestination, it is maintained, that God fore-ordained the fall of man.* That in consequence of his fall, thus pre-ordained, the whole human race becoming a mass of corruption, it was decreed by God before the foundation of the world, to choose some out of this mass to be saved, and to leave the others to everlasting misery.† "For all," says he, "are not created under the same circumstances; but to some eternal life is pre-ordained, to others, eternal damnation."‡

To these principles must be added, the irresistibility of divine grace—the absolute impossibility of the elect's falling from grace—the making God the sole operator in the work of salvation, and, of consequence, man a mere machine; and what completes the horrid picture which Calvin has given of that Being whose tender mercies are over all his works, he represents him as actually fitting the reprobates for the misery to which he has consigned them, by rendering them incapable of being profited by any means of grace whatever—by rendering them blind and stupid, and depriving them of the faculty of hearing his word to any advantage. "He directs his voice to them," says he, "for the purpose of their being made more deaf—He sets his light before them, in order that they may be rendered more blind—He holds forth doctrine to them, that they may be rendered more stupid by it—He applies a remedy, but not for the purpose of their being healed."§

This, Sir, is the amiable system which you have to defend—"A system," to use the words of the learned Jortin, "consisting of hu-

* Arcanum Dei consilium, quo præordinatus fuerat hominis lapsus. Calvin de prædest. p. 607.

† Deum ex perdita massa elegere et reprobare, &c. Ibid. p. 613.

‡ Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes, sed aliis vita eterna, aliis damnatio æterna præordinatur. Inst.

§ Quemadmodum suæ erga electos vocationis efficacia salutem, ad quam externo consilio destinarat, perficit Deus; ita sua habet adversus reprobos judicia, quibus consilium de illis suum exæquatur. Quos ergo in vitæ contumeliam et mortis exitium creavit, ut iræ suæ organa forent, et severitatis exempla, eos, ut in finem suum perveniant, nunc audiendi verbi sui facultate privat, nunc ejus predicatione magis excæcat et obstupefacit. Inst. lib. iii. cap. 24. sec. 2.

Vocem ad eos dirigit (Deus) sed ut magis obsurdescant; lucem accendit sed ut reddantur cæciores; doctrinam profert, sed qua magis obstupescant; remedium adhibet, sed ne sanentur. Ibid.

man creatures without liberty,* doctrines without sense, faith without reason, and a God without mercy."

* "We have an immediate consciousness of a freedom of will within us; or of a power to act or forbear; to act this way, or the quite contrary in all matters of duty, as well as in all things indifferent. From whence the natural deduction of reason is, that our actions being free and voluntary, they must be imputable to us with that faculty. This free principle within us is so self-evident, that no reason or argument can render it more so. All attempt of proof for the corroboration of it is utterly needless, and serves only to perplex and confound the clearest evidence the mind is capable of for the truth of any thing: So that in all contention and debate relating to this point, as well as to what immediately depends on it, the last appeal for a final decision, must be to the immediate consciousness of the mind; and he who would not determine against absolute decrees and unconditional predestination, election and reprobation, from a discernment of freedom of will within himself, must be a corrupt judge, and blinded with prejudice; and is not capable of a full conviction from any other topic." Brown's proced. hum. understanding.

Methodist Episcopacy.

A publication has fallen into our hands, said to be from the pen of a respectable Clergyman in Maryland, containing many interesting anecdotes and remarks respecting the rise and progress of what is called the METHODIST EPISCOPACY in this country. Every churchman should know the fundamental ground of distinction between a true and spurious EPISCOPACY, that he may not be imposed on by a counterfeit. To this end it is proposed to insert copious extracts from the pamphlet before us. It begins with the celebrated JOHN WESLEY'S "*Reasons for not separating from the Church*," which have already been published in our Magazine,* and then proceeds in the following manner.

FROM these sentiments of Mr. Wesley we may learn that the Methodists were, originally, both in England and America, merely a religious society in communion with the church of England.

The progress of their separation in the United States may be traced in their own popular publications; from which we may easily obtain sufficient information to enable us to judge how far they have a right to the title of an episcopal church, and also, how far their claim to an episcopal ordination, is just.

The first symptoms of separation from the church, and assumption of the power of ordination that we hear of, in the United States, took place during the revolutionary war, and is thus described by Dr. Coke and Mr. More in their "Life of Wesley," p. 350 and 351.

"During the civil war the societies were destitute of the sacra-
"ments, excepting two or three of the cities. They could not ob-
"tain baptism for their children, or the Lord's supper for them-
"selves, from the Presbyterian, Independent or Baptist Ministers,
"but on condition that they would leave the *society* of which they
"were members, and join those *churches* respectively: and many
"of the clergy of the church of England had left the country. The
"societies in general were so grieved on this account, and so influ-
"enced the minds of the preachers by their incessant complaints,

* See Magazine for August, 1806, page 301.

to himself and to his grace, by men's believing, and their consequent salvation. Eph. i. 12. Now, all these commands, threatenings, promises, and encouragements, proving, beyond the possibility of reasonable contradiction, the truth of the minor propositition, that *all men are bound to believe in Christ for salvation*, it follows irresistibly, that *Christ died for all men.*

As the Calvinistic system of divinity will, in all probability, be a subject of dispute as well as Episcopacy, I shall take the liberty, before I conclude, of drawing out that system, for the benefit of those who may not be very well acquainted with it. The following propositions are all to be found in Calvin's writings: The absolute and unconditional election or predestination of particular individuals to eternal salvation; and the equally absolute and unconditional reprobation of all the remaining part of mankind, without respect of persons. As preparatory to this divine act of predestination, it is maintained, that God fore-ordained the fall of man.* That in consequence of his fall, thus pre-ordained, the whole human race becoming a mass of corruption, it was decreed by God before the foundation of the world, to choose some out of this mass to be saved, and to leave the others to everlasting misery.† "For all," says he, "are not created under the same circumstances; but to some eternal life is pre-ordained, to others, eternal damnation."‡

To these principles must be added, the irresistibility of divine grace—the absolute impossibility of the elect's falling from grace—the making God the sole operator in the work of salvation, and, of consequence, man a mere machine; and what completes the horrid picture which Calvin has given of that Being whose tender mercies are over all his works, he represents him as actually fitting the reprobates for the misery to which he has consigned them, by rendering them incapable of being profited by any means of grace whatever—by rendering them blind and stupid, and depriving them of the faculty of hearing his word to any advantage. "He directs his voice to them," says he, "for the purpose of their being made more deaf—He sets his light before them, in order that they may be rendered more blind—He holds forth doctrine to them, that they may be rendered more stupid by it—He applies a remedy, but not for the purpose of their being healed."§

This, Sir, is the amiable system which you have to defend—"A system," to use the words of the learned Jortin, "consisting of hu-

* Arcanum Dei consilium, quo præordinatus fuerat hominis lapsus. Calvin de prædest. p. 607.

† Deum ex perdita massa elegere et reprobare, &c. Ibid. p. 613.

‡ Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes, sed aliis vita eterna, aliis damnatio æterna præordinatur. Inst.

§ Quemadmodum suæ erga electos vocationis efficacia salutem, ad quam externo consilio destinarat, perficit Deus; ita sua habet adversus reprobos judicia, quibus consilium de illis suum exæquatur. Quos ergo in vitæ contumeliam et mortis exitium creavit, ut iræ suæ organa forent, et severitatis exempla, eos, ut in finem suum perveniant, nunc audiendi verbi sui facultate privat, nunc ejus predicatione magis excæcat et obstupefacit. Inst. lib. iii. cap. 24. sec. 2.

Vocem ad eos dirigit (Deus) sed ut magis obsurdescant; lucem accendit sed ut reddantur cæciores; doctrinam profert, sed qua magis obstupescant; remedium adhibet, sed ne sanentur. Ibid.

man creatures without liberty,* doctrines without sense, faith without reason, and a God without mercy."

* "We have an immediate consciousness of a freedom of will within us; or of a power to act or forbear; to act this way, or the quite contrary in all matters of duty, as well as in all things indifferent. From whence the natural deduction of reason is, that our actions being free and voluntary, they must be imputable to us with that faculty. This free principle within us is so self-evident, that no reason or argument can render it more so. All attempt of proof for the corroboration of it is utterly needless, and serves only to perplex and confound the clearest evidence the mind is capable of for the truth of any thing: So that in all contention and debate relating to this point, as well as to what immediately depends on it, the last appeal for a final decision, must be to the immediate consciousness of the mind; and he who would not determine against absolute decrees and unconditional predestination, election and reprobation, from a discernment of freedom of will within himself, must be a corrupt judge, and blinded with prejudice; and is not capable of a full conviction from any other topic." Brown's proced. hum. understanding.

Methodist Episcopacy.

A publication has fallen into our hands, said to be from the pen of a respectable Clergyman in Maryland, containing many interesting anecdotes and remarks respecting the rise and progress of what is called the METHODIST EPISCOPACY in this country. Every churchman should know the fundamental ground of distinction between a true and spurious EPISCOPACY, that he may not be imposed on by a counterfeit. To this end it is proposed to insert copious extracts from the pamphlet before us. It begins with the celebrated JOHN WESLEY'S "*Reasons for not separating from the Church,*" which have already been published in our Magazine,* and then proceeds in the following manner.

FROM these sentiments of Mr. Wesley we may learn that the Methodists were, originally, both in England and America, merely a religious society in communion with the church of England.

The progress of their separation in the United States may be traced in their own popular publications; from which we may easily obtain sufficient information to enable us to judge how far they have a right to the title of an episcopal church, and also, how far their claim to an episcopal ordination, is just.

The first symptoms of separation from the church, and assumption of the power of ordination that we hear of, in the United States, took place during the revolutionary war, and is thus described by Dr. Coke and Mr. More in their "Life of Wesley," p. 350 and 351.

"During the civil war the societies were destitute of the sacra-
"ments, excepting two or three of the cities. They could not ob-
"tain baptism for their children, or the Lord's supper for them-
"selves, from the Presbyterian, Independent or Baptist Ministers,
"but on condition that they would leave the *society* of which they
"were members, and join those *churches* respectively: and many
"of the clergy of the church of England had left the country. The
"societies in general were so grieved on this account, and so influ-
"enced the minds of the preachers by their incessant complaints,

* See Magazine for August, 1806, page 301.

" that in the year 1778, a considerable number of them earnestly " importuned Mr. Asbury to take *proper measures*, that the people " might enjoy the privileges of all other churches, and no longer " be deprived of the christian sacraments. *Mr. Asbury's attachment " to the church of England* was at that time *exceedingly strong:* he " therefore refused them any redress. On this the majority of the " preachers withdrew from him, and consequently from Mr. Wes- " ley, and chose out of themselves three senior brethren, who or- " dained others by the imposition of their hands. The preachers " thus set apart, administered the sacraments to those they judged " proper to receive them in every place where they came. How- " ever, Mr. Asbury by indefatigable labor and attention, and by all " the address in his power, brought them back one after another, " and by a vote of one of the conferences, the ordination was de- " clared invalid; and a perfect re-union took place."

In the " *Life of Mr. Jarrat*," published by the Rev. Mr. Coleman, of the protestant Episcopal church of Maryland, we meet with a similar account, and are there told that Mr. Asbury was very active in the suppression of this schism, and to that end circulated and commented upon " *Mr. Wesley's reasons against separating from the church.*"

The account of this transaction as given by Coke and More, appears fair, candid and sufficiently circumstantial to a cursory reader; but as the subsequent conduct of the Methodist society ended in a complete separation from the church, by the introduction and reception of a new kind of ordination assuming the name of Episcopal, with the same Mr. Asbury as bishop and pontiff in America at its head; we may be justified, I should suppose, in making a few remarks on the above statement.

In the first place we are told that " the societies were destitute of sacraments, except in two or three of the cities." This is a very strained account indeed, and scarcely reconcilable with truth; for in the state of Maryland there were never less than eighteen Episcopal clergymen, at any one time, during that period, and in Virginia many more. But in this respect the Methodists had no more reason to complain than the rest of their brethren of the church of England. Indeed, had the Methodist preachers, as members of the church of England, rightly instructed their people, as, no doubt, Mr. Asbury, in consequence of his *exceeding strong attachment to the church of England*, must have taught them; they must have known that it was highly improper for them to desire the sacraments from either Presbyterian, Baptist, or independent ministers; since the church of which they professed themselves members, esteems those ordinances which are celebrated by men not episcopally ordained null and void. Besides, if Divine Providence had so ordered their situation, that they could not possibly obtain the sacraments to be administered unto them in a propor and valid manner, they should have bowed in humble acquiescence to the divine will, and been content to wait God's good pleasure: for he is not a hard master, he doth not expect to reap where he hath not sowed, and he will never blame any one for not doing that which he has not given them pow-

er to do. In fine, the Methodists should have been taught that the sacraments are only necessary to salvation where they can be had "*according to Christ's institution in all things which of necessity are requisite to the same,*" as the 19th article of the church and the 13th article of the Methodists declares. Now a minister regularly ordained is deemed by all Episcopalian churches, one essential requisite.

"*Mr. Asbury,*" then, at the head of the Methodist societies in America, under Mr. Wesley, was applied to, and solicited to "TAKE PROPER MEASURES *that the people might enjoy the privileges of other churches, and no longer be deprived of the christian sacraments.*"—The preachers who made this request, as well as their hearers, were now far gone in the way of schism. What measures could Mr. Asbury possibly take, which could be called proper? He was a mere layman, and all his preachers were laymen also. No means at that time could be carried into execution for the obtaining ordination from the English bishops. We are hence obliged to suppose that either a separation from the church, and a union with the Presbyterians, Baptists or Independents, or a mere lay ordination, was what was meant by the expression "*proper measures;*" for we find the last was resorted to when Mr. Asbury, in consequence of his *exceeding strong attachment to the church of England*, refused them any redress;—though, by the bye, it is hard to conceive what redress Mr. Asbury could have afforded them, or what proper measures he could have taken, even had he not been so *exceedingly attached to the church of England*, at that time. He, however, very properly endeavored to subdue the schismatical and separating spirit.

But alas! that spirit respects no boundaries, however sacred! Disappointed in their hopes of obtaining the countenance of Mr. Asbury, these preachers resolved to proceed to the execution of their plan without his assistance. But not willing to set aside altogether, a form which both scripture and universal practice had sanctioned and declared necessary, three senior brethren were elected to ordain *others* by the imposition of their hands; and, no doubt, *these others* returned the compliment to the *three senior brethren*.—These new-fangled ministers administered certain rites, which they called sacraments, and usurped the fulness of the ministerial office. Thus did the schismatical spirit cause these men to reverse the order of the divine institution, by prompting them to send ministers of Christ of their own making, and not permitting them to wait with patience till Christ, in the ways of his providence, might be pleased to send ministers to them, in his own order, and with his commission.

Mr. Asbury, on this occasion, gave a specimen of his amazing talents in the art of *Ignatian Government*, which afterwards raised him to the supremacy of the society, over which he actually, though not professedly, exercises an absolute sway, at this present time. By his address, it seems, he reclaimed the strayed sheep and shepherds from the unjustifiable *step* they had taken; but, we are sorry indeed to be obliged to say, that he shortly after became their head and leader in taking one, not a whit more justifiable.

"*By a vote of one of the conferences,*" this lay-"*ordination was declared invalid.*" With submission, I conceive this conference meddled with what it was not competent to decide; as it was composed of mere laymen, it possessed no ecclesiastical authority whatever; but had even all the members thereof been clergymen, the validity or invalidity of an ordination must rest on the authority of the ordainers, and not on the vote of any body of men whatever, whether civil or ecclesiastical. Had the ordination been valid in itself, an unanimous vote against it could not render it invalid, nor, being in itself invalid, a unanimous vote for it could render it valid. Let this sentiment be remembered and applied to the subsequent reception of Dr. Coke's letters of Episcopal orders given by Mr. Wesley, and it will be seen what weight ought to be attached to the declaration of the conference in 1784. "*That they were fully satisfied of the validity of Dr. Coke's and Mr. Asbury's Episcopal Ordination.*" The lay-ordination, however, of the *three senior brethren*, being set aside, we shall let it rest, fully satisfied that it met with a fate, which, we firmly believe, *all spurious ordinations* will, *sooner or later*, meet with.

In Wesley's life, written by Coke and More, p. 351, we meet with the following statement.

"When peace was established between Great Britain and the "States, the intercourse was opened between the societies in both "countries. Mr. Wesley then received from Mr. Asbury, a full "account of the progress of the work during the war; and especial-"ly of the division which had taken place, and the difficulties he "met with, before it was healed. He also informed Mr. Wesley of "the extreme uneasiness of the people's minds, for want of the sa-"craments: that thousands of their children were unbaptized; and "the members of the society in general, had not partaken of the "Lord's supper for many years. Mr. Wesley then considered the "subject, and informed Dr. Coke of his design of drawing up a "plan of church government, and of establishing an ordination, for "his American societies. But cautious of entering on so *new a* "*plan*, he afterwards suspended the execution of his purposes, and "weighed the whole for upwards of a year."

Here Dr. Coke tells us that Mr. Wesley informed him of his design of drawing up a plan of church government, and of establishing an ordination for his American societies: but Dr. Coke has not thought it expedient to inform us that he wrote to Mr. Wesley urging him to ordain him bishop, which Dr. Whitehead declares he did, and, in his "*Life of Wesley*," has published the letter. Dr. Whitehead also, speaking of the Weslian ordination, says, "*that* "*the person who advised the measure, would be proved to have been a* "*felon to Methodism, and to have stuck an assassinating knife into the* "*vitals of its body.*" Again—

Dr. Coke says, this plan of Mr. Wesley's was a *new plan*, which made him cautious of entering upon it: consequently, it was a *plan* which had neither the sanction of scripture, or the practice of the primitive church to justify his adoption of it. Well might Mr. Wesley hesitate and weigh the whole for upwards of a year; it had been still better, if he had taken *eight years longer* to have weighed

it, and made use of the balances of the sanctuary of God's church, in place of those of his own *feelings* and *inclinations*, and Dr. Coke's solicitations; it had then never been put in execution at all, or if it had, every one would have known its rightful father.

"At the conference held in Leeds 1784, he (Mr. Wesley) declar-
"ed his intention of sending Dr. Coke and some other preachers to
"America. Mr. Richard Whatcoat and Mr. Thomas Vasey offer-
"ed themselves as missionaries for that purpose, and were accepted.
"Before they sailed, Mr. Wesley abridged the common prayer
"book, and wrote to Dr. Coke then in London, desiring him to
"meet him in Bristol to receive FULLER POWERS; and to bring the
"Rev. Mr. Creighton with him. The Doctor and Mr. Creighton
"accordingly met him in Bristol, when with their assistance he or-
"dained Mr. Richard Whatcoat, and Mr. Thomas Vasey *presbyters*
"for America: and did afterwards ordain Dr. Coke a *superintendant*,
"giving him letters of ordination under his hand and seal, and at
"the same time a letter to be printed and circulated in America."

It hence appears, that at the time of holding the Leeds conference, Mr. Wesley had made up his mind respecting the *new plan of church government and ordination* he had devised for America. This conference was held July 27th, 1784. Dr. Samuel Seabury had then been some time in England, for the avowed purpose of obtaining Episcopal consecration from the English bishops—*let this be kept in mind*—and in the month of October following we find Dr. Coke and his companions on their passage to America. *See Coke's Journal.*

From the account which Dr. Coke hath given us, it doth not appear that this *new plan* was communicated by Mr. Wesley to the conference, nay, *Myles in his Chronological History of the Methodists*, p. 162, informs us, that the account of its having been carried into execution was not given to that body till 1786: consequently Mr. Wesley neither submitted his plan to the body of his preachers, nor ever obtained their sanction to it. Was it not then an act of schism, not only as it regarded the church of England, but as it regarded the Methodist society in Europe? The other biographers of Mr. Wesley, viz. Dr. Whitehead and Mr. Hampson, lead us to this conclusion, and to believe that the whole of this *new plan* was the contrivance of a few individuls, who took advantage of Mr. Wesley's age and infirmities, and who were to be invested with powers, which would enable them to appear to much advantage as fabricators of a new church in the new world. However, the whole passing as Mr. Wesley's doings, we shall consider him as the father contriver, and founder of this new fangled *episcopal church*, so called.

As Mr. Wesley was *primum mobile* to all appearance, in this business, and was to be as Myles speaks, the fountain of honor and authority in this *new religion*; and, since by altering and abridging the liturgy of the church of England, curtailing some of her articles, and entirely rejecting others, he assumed and exercised powers which hitherto had been presumed to have been invested in no less a body than the council of a national church constituted upon an apostolic foundation; a question arises, viz. by what authority he did these things?

That he did not possess such an authority in virtue of his ordination as a presbyter of the church of England, is manifest; for by that ordination he became bound to exercise his ministry as a presbyter of the church, as that church and realm had appointed: and it is well known that the church of England never conferred power on the presbyters to alter her liturgy, curtail her articles, or to ordain to any order of the ministry: nay, if words have any meaning; if solemn vows ratified and confirmed by the reception of the holy sacrament have any force; they are expressly prohibited from assuming any such powers. Hence it is evident Mr. Wesley did not derive the powers he assumed and exercised, from his ordination as a presbyter of the church of England. He, however, did assume such powers in violation of the most solemn vows he entered into when he was ordained deacon and presbyter by Dr. Potter, bishop of Oxford, afterwards translated from that see, to the Archiepiscopal see of Canterbury.

Ordination vows, and sacramental obligations on that occasion, were blotted from the remembrance of Mr. Wesley, Dr. Coke and Mr. Creighton, or, at least they determined no longer to allow themselves to be shackled by them. Their *superior holiness* disdained all such restraints. For, in a private chamber, as Dr. Whitehead asserts, and Myles indirectly acknowledges, in the city of Bristol, these three presbyters of the church of England renounced the Episcopacy of that church, and becoming, for the time and occasion, Presbyterians, they formed themselves into a Presbytery, and ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey presbyters for America. But the *new plan* being designed to bear the name of Episcopal, they quickly forsook their Presbyterianism, and became a species of Episcopalians of their own invention, and having recognized the Rev. John Wesley as their bishop, though never consecrated to that work and office, they present unto him the Rev. Dr. Coke to be made by him a bishop on a *new plan*. He receives him, and, as presiding and consecrating bishop, assisted by Mr. Presbyter Creighton, and, no doubt, by Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey also, soon made him a *newly contrived sort of bishop*. Thus the two gentlemen, viz. Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey, had very soon an opportunity of returning the favor they had received from Dr. Coke, in contributing to make him bishop, upon a *new plan*, as he just before had contributed to make them presbyters, upon a *new plan*.

These three gentlemen, viz. Dr. Coke, and Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey, are in the fourth section of the Methodist book of discipline, called, "*Regularly ordained clergy*"!!!

Now can either Episcopalians or Presbyterians, consistently with their established principles, acknowledge such ordinations to be either valid or regular? I should presume not.

It may here be proper to observe that Mr. Wesley *modestly* substituted the word *superintendant* for *bishop*, but Messrs. Coke and Asbury thought proper to assume the latter, and now pass themselves off, *in the United States*, as truly and regularly consecrated bishops!

Had the gentlemen concerned in this first ordination paid any regard to the laws of their country, or the canons of their church,

they would have known, that had they even possessed the powers of ordination, they were encroaching on the right of the bishop of Bristol, and performing an act which no bishop could regularly and canonically perform without his permission within the limits of his diocese.

We shall now make a few remarks on the letters of ordination said to have been given by Mr. Wesley to Dr. Coke.

Several years before this time Dr. Coke had received letters of ordination, both as deacon and presbyter or priest from the bishop who ordained him to those orders respectively. Hence we may conclude that the letters signed and sealed by Mr. Wesley, were neither for the order of deacon nor presbyter, but for an order superior to these, since by the ordination performed by Mr. Wesley, he is supposed to have had *fuller powers* conferred upon him, than what he before possessed. This superior order was called *superintendant:* consequently, in this *new plan*, superintendant or bishop was not considered the same as presbyter, but as an order distinct from and superior to the order of presbyter, and, we are further justified in deducing this consequence, because the Methodists in America call themselves, not presbyterial, but episcopal Methodists; they have declared the episcopal form of government to be the *most excellent*,* and have adopted *three distinct offices* of ordination for *three distinct orders of ministers*, viv. bishops or superintendants, elders or presbyters, and deacons. In each of these offices, the following words, or those of the same import are to be found.—Thus in the office of deacons, "O God, who hast appointed *divers orders*, in thy church," &c. and then the order of deacon is specified as one of those *divers orders*, by praying "that God would give his "grace to this his servant now called to the office of deacon." In the office for presbyters or elders, the same passages are found, only the word "*presbyter*" or "*elder*" stands in the place of the word "*deacon*," to denote that elder or presbyter is another of those *divers orders*. And in the office for bishops or superintendants, we find the same sentiments still advanced, the word "*bishop*" or "*superintendant*" being put in the place of the word "*elder*" or "*deacon*," to declare that bishops or superintendants are likewise a third order which God hath established in his church. With such documents staring them in the face, it is astonishing that any Methodist should now be contending for the validity of presbyterian ordination, in order to serve as a prop to support their *new planned* episcopacy: or that they should be endeavoring to prove episcopacy only a human institution, and, that the presbyterian was the apostolic mode of conferring the ministerial authority!

Shortly after this Weslian ordination in the private chamber, Dr. Coke, the bishop upon a *new plan*, and Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey, presbyters and assistant bishop-makers upon a new plan, set sail for America with their stock in trade, viz. the abridged liturgy,

* If the episcopal form of government be the *most excellent*, we may safely conclude it to be apostolic and divine: since we cannot suppose the apostles did not establish a church government, neither can we suppose they omitted to establish that which was *most excellent*. If presbytery was the apostolic mode, as some Methodists now assert, how dare they presume to say with their church, that the episcopalian mode is the *most excellent*.

Mr. Wesley's circular letter to the American Methodists, Dr. Coke's credentials with Wesley's signature and seal, and Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey's letters of ordination. In America we shall meet with them before long, carrying the *new plan* into more extensive operation than they had *room* to do in the city of Bristol.

[To be continued.]

FROM THE ORTHODOX CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE.

Remarks on the Doctrine of Original Sin.

To the Editors of the Orthodox Churchman's Magazine:

GENTLEMEN,

THERE is no one cause, I apprehend, that has produced stronger prejudices against revelation at large, than mistaken opinions originating in partial views of its particular doctrines. The chief prejudices against the truly important and fundamental doctrine, of which I propose to treat, arise from such imperfect views of the subject, and from putting asunder correlative circumstances, which God has inseparably joined together. For the same sentence which decreed the punishment of Adam and of all his posterity, decreed at the same time the correlative means of restoration to happiness. (Gen. iii. 15.) The means of obtaining eternal life and bliss were indeed changed, but they were not annihilated. Man indeed ceased to be able to save himself by his own unassisted powers, and he acquired evil propensities, which he could not by his own unaided will overcome. But although in one scale the effects of the fall were cast, yet in the opposite scale were cast the effects of the obedience and atonement of the Lamb of God, "slain from the foundation of the world;" and the balance thereby perhaps more than restored. (Gen. xlviii. 15, 16.) If, to illustrate my position, every son of Adam is born blind into the world, nevertheless "Christ enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world." (John i. 9.) This our blessed Savior has done, it is true, in different degrees, as he saw fit; but he has done it so far, at all times, as to restore every man to such a degree of free agency, as to enable him, by walking according to the light given to him, to save his soul alive.

Now, if we may be allowed to reason *à priori* upon this high question, perhaps the superhuman wisdom of this dispensation may in some measure appear. For if it be admitted that man was created a free agent, it follows that he must have been liable to stand or fall. I believe, too, that it will not be denied that pride is the first and great cause of the fall of every free agent. "Aspiring to be gods, angels fell." Desirous likewise to know by their own experience good and evil, and thence to form their choice of their own proper good, rather than with humility and faith to give credit to their all-wise Creator, our first parents began that series of experiments which occasioned their fall, and which has been and will be continued by their descendants, till they shall have learned that God is wiser than men, and that he alone can point out to them their own proper good, the tree of life. (See Ps. cix. 9, Acts 5. 30.)

Our Savior's perfect knowledge of the nature of free agents probably induced him to commence his instructions with, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Further, the first free agent that fell, must have fallen self-tempted, and has probably fallen irrecoverably into the lowest abyss. The circumstance, that man fell by the temptation of another, may have broken or suspended his fall, and given occasion for the assisting impulse of grace to counterbalance his temptations and evil propensities. For had grace been given to him before an opposite evil propensity or temptation had taken place, it might perhaps have interfered with, and overset his free agency; whereas now it seems to restore it with increased advantages. For the consciousness of being in a degenerate and helpless state is calculated to excite humility, which is the security and wisdom of the creature; and humility is further increased in man when the Gospel reveals unto him, that if he will be saved, he must *condescend* to be saved by another.

Thus is the pride of the creature mortified, and thus man, when he is weak, is strong, and when he is foolish, is wise. Thus, too, it may be presumed, that by a dispensation so preventive and subversive of pride and its consequences, more persons will be preserved from an irrecoverable fall and ruin, than perhaps could have been saved by any other possible means. The argument will be confirmed by a consideration of the seemingly parallel case of St. Paul, described in 2 Cor. xii. 7—11; and we may now answer the unbeliever in the words spoken by the Lord to Esdras, who had been reflecting upon original sin—"Thou comest far short, that thou shouldest be able to love my creature more than I." (Esd. viii. 47.)

I shall conclude with observing, that the efficacy of Christ's atonement has been operating from the beginning, and that the evil propensities of our natures have perhaps thereby been in some measure already mitigated. The earth from which man is taken was cursed, together with its offspring, as an image of, and speculum to, Eve and all her spiritually barren offspring. The effects of the corruption of human nature and of the earth corresponded, and appeared in their greatest malignity in the old world. (See Sherlock's Sermons on the Prophecies.) But by the destruction of the old world, the human race was reduced to the family of one pious, common parent, the glorious type of the second Adam; and thereby the human race was probably meliorated, and the curse upon the earth, in correspondency, mitigated. (Gen. v. 29, and viii. 21.)

And the time will come, probably in this life, when the good and evil seed, the wheat and the tares, shall be still farther separated, (Luke xvii. 27) and when, as Isaiah foretells, "Thy people also shall be all righteous," (Is. lx. 21) "and the wilderness (in unison) shall blossom as the rose." (Is. xxxv. 1.)

There shall indeed come a time, and God grant that it may soon arrive, when Paradise shall descend upon earth, in the midst of which "there shall be the tree of life, and the leaves of the tree (shall be) for the healing of the nations, and *there shall be no more curse.*" (Rev. xxii. 2, 3.) I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient humble servant,

JUVENIS.

[FROM THE SAME.]

Letter from Sir Isaac Newton to Dr. Bentley.

SIR,

WHEN I wrote my treatise about our system, I had an eye upon such principles as might work with considering men for the belief of a Deity; and nothing can rejoice me more than to find it useful for that purpose. But if I have done the public any service this way, it is due to nothing but industry and patient thought.

As to your first query, it seems to me, that if the matter of our sun and planets, and all the matter of the universe, were evenly scattered throughout all the heavens, and every particle had an innate gravity towards all the rest, and the whole space throughout which this matter was scattered was but finite, the matter on the outside of this space would, by its gravity, tend towards all the matter on the inside, and, by consequence, fall down into the middle of the whole space, and there compose one great spherical mass. But if the matter was evenly disposed throughout an infinite space, it would never convene into one mass; but some of it convene into one mass, and some into another, so as to make an infinite number of great masses, scattered at great distances from one another throughout all that infinite space; and thus might the sun aud fixed stars be formed, supposing the matter were of a lucid nature. But how the matter should divide itself into two sorts, and that that part which is fit to compose a shining body, should fall down into one mass, and make a sun; and the rest, which is fit to compose an opaque body, should coalesce, not into one great body, like the shining matter; but into many little ones; or if the sun was at first an opaque body, like the planets, or the planets lucid bodies like the sun, how he alone should be changed into a shining body, whilst all they continue opaque, or all they be changed into opaque ones, whilst he remains unchanged; I do not think explicable by mere natural causes, but am forced to ascribe it to the counsel and contrivance of a voluntary agent.

The same power, whether natural or supernatural, which placed the sun in the center of the six primary planets, placed Saturn in the center of the orbs of his five secondary planets, and Jupiter in the center of his four secondary planets, and the earth in the center of the moon's orb; and, therefore, had this cause been a blind one, without contrivance or design, the Sun would have been a body of the same kind with Saturn, Jupiter, and the Earth, that is, without light and heat. Why there is one body in one system, qualified to give light and heat to all the rest, I know no reason, but because the Author of the system thought it convenient; and why there is but one body of this kind, I know no reason, but because one was sufficient to warm and enlighten all the rest. For the Cartesian hypothesis, of suns losing their light, and then turning into comets, and comets into planets, can have no place in my system, and is plainly erroneous, because it is certain, that as often as they appear to us, they descend into the system of our planets, lower than the orb of Jupiter, and sometimes lower than the orbs of Venus and Mercury, and yet never stay here, but always return from the sun with the same degrees of motion by which they approached him.

To your second query I answer, that the motions which the planets now have, could not spring from any natural cause alone, but were impressed by an intelligent agent; for, since comets descend into the region of our planets, and here move all manner of ways, going sometimes the same way with the planets, sometimes the contrary way, and sometimes in cross ways, in planes inclined to the plane of the ecliptic, and at all kinds of angles, 'tis plain that there is no natural cause which could determine all the planets, both primary and secondary, to move the same way, and in the same plane, without any considerable variation; this must have been the effect of counsel.

Nor is there any natural cause which could give the planets those just degrees of velocity, in proportion to their distances from the sun, and other central bodies, which were requisite to make them move in such excentric orbs about those bodies. Had the planets been as swift as comets, in proportion to their distances from the sun (as they would have been, had their motion been caused by their gravity, whereby the matter, at the first formation of the planets, might fall from the remotest regions towards the sun,) they would not move in concentric orbs, but in such excentric ones as the comets move in. Were all the planets as swift as Mercury, or as slow as Saturn or his satellites; or were there several velocities otherwise much greater or less than they are, as they might have been; had they arose from any other cause than their gravities; or had the distances from the centres about which they move been greater or less than they are with the same velocities; or had the quantity of matter in the sun, or in Saturn, Jupiter, and the earth, and, by consequence, their gravitating power been greater or less than it is, the primary planets could not have revolved about the sun, nor the secondary ones about Saturn, Jupiter, and the earth, in concentric circles as they do, but would have moved in hyperbolas or parabolas, or in ellipses very eccentric. To make this system, therefore, with all its motions, required a cause which understood and compared together the quantities of matter in the several bodies of the sun and planets, and the gravitating powers resulting from thence, the several distances of the primary planets from the sun, and of the secondary ones from Saturn, Jupiter, and the earth, and the velocities with which these planets could revolve about those quantities of matter in the central bodies; and to compare and adjust all these things together in so great a variety of bodies, argues that cause to be not blind or fortuitous, but very well skilled in mechanics and geometry.

To your third query I answer, that it may be represented, that the sun may, by heating those planets most which are nearest to him, cause them to be better concocted, and more condensed by concoction. But when I consider that our earth is much more heated in its bowels below the upper crust, by subterraneous fermentations of mineral bodies than by the sun, I see not why the interior parts of Jupiter and Saturn might not be as much heated, concocted, and coagulated by those fermentations, as our earth is; and, therefore, this various density should have some other cause than the various distances of the planets from the sun: and I am confirmed in this opinion, by considering that the planets of Jupiter and Saturn, as they are rarer than the rest, so they are vastly greater, and contain a

far greater quantity of matter, and have many satellites about them; which qualifications surely arose not from their being placed at so great a distance from the sun, but were rather the cause why the Creator placed them at a great distance; for, by their gravitating powers, they disturb one another's motions very sensibly, as I find by some late observations of Mr. Flamstead; and, had they been placed much nearer to the sun, and to one another, they would, by the same powers, have caused a considerable disturbance in the whole system.

To your fourth query I answer, that in the hypothesis of vortices, the inclination of the axis of the earth might, in my opinion, be ascribed to the situation of the earth's vortex, before it was absorbed by the neighboring vortices, and the earth turned from a sun to a comet; but this inclination ought to decrease constantly, in compliance with the motion of the earth's vortex, whose axis is much less inclined to the ecliptic, as appears by the motion of the moon carried about therein. If the sun by his rays could carry about the planets, yet I do not see how he could thereby effect their diurnal motions.

Lastly, I see nothing extraordinary in the inclination of the earth's axis for proving a Deity, unless you will urge it as a contrivance for winter and summer, and for making the earth habitable towards the poles, and that the diurnal rotations of the sun and planets, as they could hardly arise from any cause purely mechanical, so by being determined all the same way with the annual and menstrual motions, they seem to make up that harmony in the system which, as I explained above, was the effect of choice rather than chance.

There is yet another argument for a Deity, which I take to be a very strong one; but, till the principles on which it is grounded be better received, I think it advisable to let it sleep.

I am
Your most humble servant to command,
ISAAC NEWTON.

Cambridge, Dec. 10, 1807.

To the Rev. Dr. Richard Bentley, at the Bp. of Worcester's House, in Park-street, Westminster.

POETRY.

LINES

Written in a country Burial Place, in Scituate, Massachusetts.

[Concluded.]

The green turf swells above thy mouldering clay,
The moss has strew'd it with the softest felt,
The violets here their loveliest hues display,
To deck the bed on which he oft has knelt.

This humble stone, which fond affection plac'd
To mark the spot, and to preserve thy name,
Though by a rude unlettered artist trac'd,
On his regard has more than marble's claim.

Sacred to thee forever may it stand;
Forbear, O TIME! the tablet to destroy
Whose lay disarms the king of terror's hand—

"*Death is the gate to everlasting Joy.*"

This truth believ'd, no more shall baseless fear
Attend the word that speaks of leaving earth,
We seek for happiness—it dwells not here,
In Heaven alone are joys of lasting worth.

Here some repose who scarce receiv'd their birth
Ere death consign'd them to the silent tomb,
Small, though sufficient, is their lot of earth—
The flow'rs, transplanted, will forever bloom.

No age is free from DEATH's insatiate bow,
His shafts are levell'd, and his victim's fall!
The rose of infancy, or fore-score snow,
Alike avail not, he must conquer all.

Those rustic biers against the wall reclin'd,
The waiting bearers of the archer's prey,
Impress this serious truth upon the mind,
Existence is not certain for a day!

How oft this pious, all-important theme
Hast thou impress'd upon thy listening boy,
My much lov'd Mother!—but the playful dream
Of childhood pictured only scenes of joy.

Then would we come, my little sisters too,
And one fond brother, through this yard to stray,
Our destin'd beds beneath the sod to view,
Survey these stones, and read the uncouth lay.

Then as the shades of evening veil'd the plains,
Back to yon mansion we would gaily stroll,
The humble benefice which still sustains
The careful guardian of the christian soul.

Beneath that roof I first inhal'd the air,
Poor were my parents, hard they earn'd their bread,
Rich only in a reputation fair,
And *own'd* no mansion where to lay the head.

Along yon streamlet where the whispering reeds,
And fragrant flags upon its border play,
Where thro' those cedars it meandering leads,
My infant footsteps first were taught to stray.

And how a Mother's tender, anxious care,
Has oft depriv'd me of this little joy!
The last love-pledge of this connubial pair,
Their fears were ever wakeful for the boy.

The sylvan Muse entic'd me to her cell,
My childish fingers wanton'd o'er her lyre,
Bade the rude strain, untaught, to wildly swell,
While to the sound each throbbing pulse beat higher.

Then as I grew and learn'd to sweep the strings
By art directed, though less sweetly wild,
I envied not the happiness of kings,
My lyre was bliss, and I a happy child.

But why recount the joys of childhood o'er?
That happy state with all its joys has fled!
As fade the beauties of the tender flower,
When WINTER beats upon its drooping head.

But see! the ocean sparkles on the sight,
What lovely hues upon its surface play!
The liquid mirror streams with dazzling light,
Reflected from the rising god of day.

He comes! and nature hails his glad'ning beams,
New life pervades her animated part,
Nor less improv'd the vegetable seems,
Its charms increase, and laugh at mimic art.

Not long ago adown the western skies
He sunk, and left the mourning world in gloom,
But only sunk at night again to rise
In tenfold splendor from his watery tomb.

So though we sink beneath the verdant sod,
And leave our friends in mournful weeds and tears,
We only sink to rise and dwell with GOD,
An age unmeasured by successive years.

There we shall meet, dear Mother! yet again,
Thou art but gone before a little while;
There Joy is endless, unalloy'd with pain,
There an eternal round of summers smile.

Fly swift, ye winged hours, and be my lot
To count but few, ere death shall aim the dart,
Then lowly let me rest beneath this spot,
And lose the anguish of an aching heart.

Short be my life, yet then if sorrows count,
A lengthen'd age should clothe my head in snow,
O could my virtues gain but their amount,
Perfection would have once been found below.

Adieu, dear spot! necessity commands
The youth who loves you far from hence away,
But while a thought of home his breast expands,
Your dear remembrance never can decay! SELIM.

[Original in the Connecticut Herald of Aug. 18.]

FRIENDSHIP.

WHAT power can prop a sinking soul,
Oppress with woes, and sick of grief,
Bid the warm tear forbear to roll,
Despair's heart-rending sigh control,
And whisper sweet relief?

Friendship! sweet balm for sorrow's smart,
In thee the soothing power is found,
To heal the lacerated heart,
Extract affliction's venom'd dart,
And close the rankling wound.

When pierc'd by grief's chill tempest through,
The tendril bends beneath its power,
Thou canst the broken plant renew,
Thy sacred tear, like heavenly dew,
Revives the drooping flower.

If Fortune frown—if Health depart,
Or death divide the tenderest tie,
Friendship can raise the sinking heart,
A glow of real joy impart,
And wipe the tearful eye.

If foes without attack our name,
Or foes within assault our peace,
Then Friendship's pure celestial flame,
Can heal our malice-wounded fame,
And bid internal tumults cease.

If hopeless Love our bliss destroy,
And fill the breast with black despair,
All peace such sufferers can enjoy,
Is built by Friendship's kind employ,
Which lessens every care.

Come, then, sweet power of source divine,
Forever glow within my breast,
My earliest Friend be ever mine,
One link our hearts in union join,
And each make either blest.

SELIM.

Gleanings.

RISE OF THE PURITANS.

IN Sir George Paul's life of Archbishop Whitgift, there is a trifling circumstance related, which is supposed to have given rise to the dissenters in the reign of Elizabeth.

The circumstance is this: The first discontentment of Master Cartwright, (a Fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge and a celebrated disputant) grew at a public act in that university before queen Elizabeth; because Master Preston, (then of King's college and afterwards Master of Trinity hall) for his *comely gesture* and pleasing

pronunciation, was both liked and rewarded by her Majesty; and himself *received neither reward nor commendation*, presuming of his own good scholarship. This his no small grief he uttered unto divers of his friends in Trinity college, who were also much discontented, because the honor of the disputation did not redound unto their college. Master Cartwright, immediately after her Majesty's neglect of him, began to trade in divers opinions, as that of the discipline, and to kick against her ecclesiastical government; and that he might the better feed his mind with novelties, he travelled to Geneva, where he was so far carried away with an affection of their new-devised discipline, as that he thought all churches and congregations for governments ecclesiastical, were to be measured and squared by the practice of Geneva. Therefore when he returned home, he took many exceptions against the established government of the church of England, and the observation of its rites and ceremonies, and the administration of its holy sacraments; and buzzed these conceits into the heads of divines, young preachers, and scholars of the university of Cambridge, and drew after him a great number of disciples and followers. Cartwright afterwards disturbs the state of the university; is recommended to be quiet, but to no purpose; is at last expelled, after having refused to assist at a conference which Archbishop Whitgift offered him. Cartwright afterwards published, in 1591, a book of new discipline, for which he was proceeded against in the Star Chamber.

ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT.

THE mention of this great prelate, whom queen Elizabeth used to call her little black husband, gives us an occasion to quote what the judicious and temperate Hooker says of him, which is alone sufficient to wipe off all the foul aspersions cast upon his name by the Puritans.

"He always governed," says Hooker, "with that moderation which useth by patience to suppress boldness, and to make them conquer that suffer.

LORD BURLEIGH.

THIS great statesman was very much pressed by some of the disaffected divines in his time, who waited on him in a body, to make some alterations in the articles and liturgy. He desired them to go into the next room by themselves, and bring him in their unanimous opinion upon some disputed points. They returned, however, without being able to agree. "Why gentlemen" said he, "how can you expect that I should alter any point in dispute, when you who must be more competent, from your situation, to judge than I can possibly be, cannot *agree* yourselves in what manner you would have me alter it."

With respect to the education of children he used to say: "that the unthrifty looseness of youth in this age was the *parent's* faults, who made them *men seven years too soon*, having but children's judgments."

The same great man was wont to say, "I will never trust any man not of sound religion; for he that is false to God, can never be true to man."

THOMAS STERNHOLD.

THIS person, who has perpetuated his name by a well known version of the psalms in metre, was a native of Hampshire, and educated at Wykeham's school near Winchester, after which he studied at Oxford, but left the university without a degree and became groom of the robes to King Henry VIII. who by his will left him a legacy of one hundred marks. He continued in the same office to Edward VI. and was in some esteem at court, for his vein in poetry. Being a zealous reformer, he became so scandalized at the amorous and obscene songs used in the court, that he turned into English metre fifty-one of David's psalms, and caused musical notes to be set to them; thinking thereby that the courtiers would sing them instead of their sonnets; but they did not, only some few excepted. "However, the poetry and music being admirable, (says Wood) and the best that was made and composed in those times, they were thought fit afterwards to be sung in all parochial churches. All those psalms which he put into rhyme, have the letters T. S. set before them to distinguish them from others. What other poetry, or what prose, this our Sternhold hath composed, does not appear." He died in 1549.

Cotemporary with Sternhold was JOHN HOPKINS, who turned into metre fifty eight of David's psalms, which in all the editions of that version have the two letters J. H. set before them. He appears to have been a schoolmaster in Suffolk. The other translators were WILLIAM WHITTINGHAM, afterwards the unworthy dean of Durham, who made considerable dilapidations in that cathedral, being a puritan: and THOMAS NORTON, who was a barrister, and translated several books from the latin into English. Their respective signatures are to the psalms translated by them. Of this famous version curious is the account given by Dr. Heylyn: "About this time," says he, "the psalms of David did first begin to be composed in English metre by Thomas Sternhold, one of the grooms of the privy chamber, who left both example and encouragement to John Hopkins and others to dispatch the rest. A device first taken up in France, by one Clement Marot, one of the grooms of the bed chamber about King Francis I. who being much addicted to poetry, and having some acquaintance with those that were thought to have inclined to the reformation, was persuaded by the learned Vatablus, (professor of the Hebrew language in Paris) to exercise his poetical fancy in translating some of David's psalms, for whose satisfaction and his own, he translated the first fifty of them; and after flying to Geneva, grew acquainted with Beza, who in some tract of time translated the other hundred also, and caused them to be fitted to several tunes, which thereupon began to be sung in private houses; and by degrees to be taken up in all churches of the French nation which followed the Geneva platform. The translation is said by Strada to have been ignorantly and perversely done, as being the

work of a man altogether unlearned; but not to be compared with the barbarity and botching, which every where occurreth in the translation of Sternhold and Hopkins; which notwithstanding being allowed for private devotion, they were by little and little brought into the use of the church and permitted, rather than allowed to be sung before and after sermons. Afterwards they were printed and bound up in the common prayer book, and at last added by the stationers to the end of the Bible. For though it be expressed in the title of these singing psalms, that they were set forth and allowed to be sung before and after morning and evening prayer, and also before and after sermons, yet this allowance seems rather to have been a connivance than an approbation; no such allowance being any where found by such as have been most industrious and concerned in the search thereof. At first it was pretended only that the said psalms should be sung before and after morning and evening prayer, and also before and after sermons; which shows they were not to be intermingled with the public liturgy; but in some tract of time, they prevailed in most places to thrust the *Te Deum*, the *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, and the *Nunc Dimittis*, quite out of our church."

Although there be much truth in this relation of Heylyn's, yet his censure is too general and severe; for many of the psalms in this version are truly excellent, and far superior to any other poetical translation. The old hundred infinitely exceeds that in Tate and Brady's version. Good bishop Beveridge wrote a little book in defence of Sternhold and Hopkins; and a living prelate of pre-eminent learning and judgment, has pronounced this version to be more exact and agreeable to the original than the other.

ALEXANDER NOWELL.

IN Brasenose-college, Oxford, is a portrait of this learned divine, with fishing tackle about him; he having been a great angler. He became principal of that house, and dean of St. Paul's. "For thirty years together," says Wood, "he preached the first and last sermons in the time of lent before Queen Elizabeth, wherein he dealt plainly and faithfully with her without dislike; only at one time speaking less reverently of the sign of the cross, she called aloud to him from her closet window, commanding him to retire from that ungodly digression, and stick to his text. He wrote several pieces, the most noted of which was his catechism in latin, and translated into Greek and English. He died in 1601.

BISHOP BEDELL.

THIS excellent prelate, to whom the Irish are indebted for the translation of the Bible into their language, was bishop of Kilmore. Like the good bishop Berkeley, he would never be translated to another see, thinking with him, that his church was his wife, and his diocese his children, from whom he should never be divorced. "Bishop Bedell lived with his clergy," says his biographer,

" as if they had been his brethren. When he went his visitations, he would not accept of the invitations that were made to him by the great men of the country, but he would needs eat with his brethren, in such poor inns, and of such course fare, as the place afforded. He went about always on foot, (one servant only attending him) except upon public occasions, that obliged him to ride in procession with his brethren. He never kept a coach in his life; his strength always enabling him to ride on horseback. Many poor Irish families were entertained out of his kitchen, and in the Christmas time he had the poor always eating with him at his own table, and he brought himself to endure both the sight of their rags and of their rudeness. He by his will ordered his body to be buried in a churchyard, with this inscription:

Depositum Gulielmi quondam Episcopi Kilmorensis.

He did not like the burying in a church; for, as he observed, there was much both of superstition and pride in it; so he believed it was a great annoyance to the living, where there was so much of the steam of dead bodies rising about them. He was likewise much offended at the rudeness which the crowding the dead bodies into a small parcel of ground occasioned, for the bodies already laid there, and not yet quite rotten, were often raised and mangled; so that he made a canon in his synod against burying in churches, and recommended that burying places should be removed out of towns."

In this he agreed with the pious and exemplary bishop Hall, who, in a sermon preached at the consecration of a burying ground at Exeter, delivers the same sentiments against interments in churches.

Ecclesiastical News.

ON the 16th inst. the Bishop of Connecticut, with a number of his Presbyters, assembled at the Episcopal Church in Bridgeport, when the Church was consecrated, and called by the name of St. John's Church; at which time also Mr. David Baldwin, of Guilford, Mr. Benjamin Benham, of New-Milford, and Mr. Zalmon Wheaton, of Stamford, were admitted to the holy order of Deacons. Prayers were read by the Rev. Philo Shelton, and an appropriate Sermon was delivered by the Rev. Daniel Burhans.

On the 17th the Bishop attended at the Church in Trumbull, and administered the rite of confirmation to forty-one persons. The prayers were read by the Rev. Mr. Shelton, and the Sermon was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Todd.

On the 18th the Episcopal Church at New-Stratford was consecrated by the Bishop, and named St. Peter's Church; prayers were read by the Rev. Mr. Burhans, and an appropriate Sermon was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Baldwin. At this Church the rite of confirmrtion was administred to thirty-six persons.

On Sunday the 20th the Bishop admitted Mr. Virgel Horace Barber, and Mr. Asa Cornwall to the holy order of Priests; the Rev. Mr. Baldwin delivered a Sermon on the occasion; in the afternoon the rite of confirmation was administered by the Bishop to twenty-seven persons. Evening prayers were read by the Rev. Mr. Barber, and a Sermon was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Cornwall.